

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-13, 16-18 and 21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 10, 16 and 21 are amended and claims 3, 7-8 and 59-61 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 6,711,004 to Yen et al. (hereafter Yen) in view of newly-cited U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0198006 to Hirayama et al. (hereafter Hirayama) and newly-cited U.S. Patent 6,771,494 to Shimano. The Office Action also rejects claims 2, 7, 8 and 10, 13, 16, 17, 21 and 59-61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yen, Hirayama, Shimano in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0188144 to Du et al. (hereafter Du). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a portable computer unit including a display module whose rotational state allows a system mode to be switched between a notebook computer mode and a tablet computer mode, and a rotation detection switch to provide a rotation detection signal having either a first state or a second state. Independent claim 1 also recites a controller, responsive to a system power supply of the portable computer being turned on to recognize a notebook computer mode when the rotation detection signal is in a first state and to recognize a tablet computer mode when the rotation detection signal is in a second state. Independent claim 1 also recites that the controller operates an application program for the tablet computer mode or the notebook computer mode according to the recognition, wherein the controller provides

Reply to Office Action dated February 13, 2008

inactivation of a keyboard when the controller recognizes the tablet computer mode. Independent claim 1 also recites the controller selects and boots an operating system (OS) for a tablet computer when a detected rotation state of the display module corresponds to the tablet computer mode, and the controller selects and boots an OS for a notebook computer when a detected rotation state of the display module corresponds to the notebook computer mode.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1, which includes features from previous dependent claims 3 and 7-8. More specifically, the applied references do not teach or suggest a rotation detection switch to provide a rotation detection signal having either a first state or a second state and a controller to recognize a notebook computer mode when the rotation detection signal is in a first state and to recognize a tablet computer mode when the rotation detection signal is in a second state in combination with the controller selecting and booting an operating system for a tablet computer when a detected rotation state of the display module corresponds to the tablet computer mode and the controller selects and boots an OS for a notebook computer when a detected rotation state of the display module corresponds to the notebook computer mode.

The Office Action (on page 3) states that Yen does not teach a rotation detection switch to provide a rotation detection signal having a first state or a second state. Rather, Yen, which is the primary reference, discloses an apparatus may be operated in a normal mode or tablet mode depending on two switches 31 and 41. See Yen's col. 6, lines 27-43. The Office Action then cites Hirayama as disclosing a rotational position detection sensor 14 for coupling a manipulation part 2 and a display part 3. When discussing features of dependent claim 7, the Office Action states

Reply to Office Action dated February 13, 2008

that Yen (and presumably Hirayama) does not teach loading of different operating systems corresponding to a tablet mode or a notebook mode. The Office Action (on page 5) then cites Du's FIG. 5 as teaching a computer system that is capable of operating in either a normal PC mode or a personal digital assistant mode. However, there is no suggestion in Du for a controller selects and boots different OS based on a detected rotation state of the display module. None of the references teach this feature. Further, there is not suggestion in the prior art to modify Yen's two switches 31 and 41 such that a controller selects and boots OS based on a detected rotational state of the display module.

The Office Action (on page 4) also cites Shimano for features relating to disabling a keyboard and other primary input devices. However, the cited section merely states that a user may be prevented from accessing the keyboard by placing the display device over the keyboard. This does not suggest the claimed feature of the controller provides inactivation of a keyboard when the controller recognizes the tablet computer mode. There further is no suggestion for the specifically claimed features of the controller provides inactivation and the controller selects and boots OS based on a detected rotation state of the design module.

The applied references do not teach or suggest the specific combinations relating to a rotation detection switch to provide a rotation signal having either a first state or a second state, the controller provides inactivation of a keyboard when the controller recognizes the tablet computer mode in combination with the controller selects and boots an operating system for a tablet computer when a detection rotation state of the display module corresponds to the tablet computer mode, and the controller selects and boots an OS for a notebook computer when the

Reply to Office Action dated February 13, 2008

detected rotation state of the display module corresponds to the notebook computer mode. That is, the applied references, including Du, do not relate to the rotation detection signal, the controller selects and boots different operating systems based on the detected rotation state in combination with the controller to provide a keyboard in an inactivation state when the controller recognizes the tablet computer mode.

For at least these reasons, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites detection means for detecting the rotation state of the display module when a system power supply provided in the portable computer is turned on, the detection means including a rotation detection switch to provide a rotation detection signal having either a first state or a second state. Independent claim 10 also recites control means for selectively booting an operating system (OS) for a tablet computer when the control means recognizes a tablet computer mode by the rotation detection signal being in the first state and for selectively booting an OS for a notebook computer when the control means recognizes a notebook computer mode by the rotation detection signal being in the second state. Independent claim 10 also recites that the control means further deactivates a keyboard of the portable computer when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the first state and then activates the keyboard when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the second state.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. More specifically, the applied references do not teach or suggest the control means further deactivates a keyboard of the portable

Reply to Office Action dated February 13, 2008

computer when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the first state and then activates the keyboard when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the second state. The applied references also do not teach or suggest the specifically claimed features of the control means for selectively booting an OS by the rotation detection signal being in a first/second state in combination with the control means deactivates/activates a keyboard when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the first/second state. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 16 recites detecting a state of a rotation detection signal when a system power supply provided in the portable computer is turned on, and selectively booting an initialization application program for a tablet computer when the portable computer is recognized to be in a tablet computer mode based on the rotation detection signal being detected to be in a first state. Independent claim 16 also recites selectively booting an initialization application program for a notebook computer when the portable computer is recognized to be in a notebook computer mode based on the rotation detection signal being detected to be in a second state. Still further, independent claim 16 also recites providing a keyboard in an inactivation state when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the first state and changing the keyboard from the inactivation state to an activation state when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the second state.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 16. Thus, independent claim 16 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 21 recites the portable computer to: detect the rotation state of the display module when a system power supply provided in the portable computer is enabled, selectively boot an operating system (OS) for a tablet computer when the portable computer is determined to be in a specific mode based on the rotation detection signal being detected to be in a first state, and selectively boot an initialization program for a notebook computer when the portable computer is determined to be in a specific mode based on the rotation detection signal being detected to be in a second state. Additionally, independent claim 21 further recites the portable computer to provide a keyboard in an inactivation state when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the first state and the portable computer to change the keyboard from the inactivation state to an activation state when the rotation detection signal is detected to be in the second state.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 21. Thus, independent claim 21 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-13, 16-18

Serial No. **10/812,905**

Docket No. **LT-0056**

Reply to Office Action dated February 13, 2008

and 21 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: June 11, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610